

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 16, and 31-34 are currently being amended. Accordingly, claims 1-45 are submitted for reconsideration. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Claims 32-34 have been amended to correct an improperly designated claim dependency.

In the Office Action, claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dusevic et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0055868) in view of Leisten et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,702). Claim 1, as amended, recites that a method for executing an application comprises, *inter alia*, identifying one or more rules applicable to the first application, executing one or more generic tasks stored in a first area accessible to all customers according to the identified one or more rules, and executing at least one customized task according to the identified one or more rules, the at least one customized task being stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer, wherein the at least one customized task is different from any generic task and generated according to information provided by the first customer.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner asserted that the macro tasks in Dusevic correspond to the claimed generic tasks, and the personal binder in Dusevic enables access to information that is customized by and targeted to each user. Although not explicitly stated, it appears that the personal binder in Dusevic is asserted to be corresponding to the claimed customized task. Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

With respect to the personal binder, Dusevic discloses according to Fig. 17 that the role of the personal binder is to emulate the physical binder that is typically used by geologists and geophysicists, where they print out key pieces of information frequently referenced and store for easy access (see [0356]). In particular, once a key piece of information is found, the user has the ability to store the link in their personal binder so that

they are not forced to re-navigate through the system again, as well as to store responses to a particular customer's specific questions (see [0356]). The user may add and/or delete interface items and personalize the appearance, behavior and/or contents of the user's personal binder (see [0356]). Access to one or more features of the personal binder may be protected by requiring a user ID and/or password (see [0356]).

Dusevic further discloses that if an end user locates a valuable piece of information within the task-centric online environment, the end user may choose to add the information to their personal binder (see [0358]). In addition, the end user may then access pieces of information (content) that were added from the task-centric online environment by selecting links listed in the personal binder (see [0358]).

Dusevic also discloses that the interface to the personal binder may be presented to the user as a web page in response to the user selecting a user interface item on a previous web page (see [0359]). Selecting an interface item 302 may change the appearance and contents of a portion of the personal binder web page (see [0359]). For example, by selecting an interface item 302, the system may actually navigate to a different web page, but to the end user, it may appear that only a portion of the personal binder web page has changed (see [0359]).

In summary, Dusevic discloses that the personal binder enables a user to store information identified through the task-centric online environment so that a user need not search again to find the same information. Furthermore, the personal binder may use a portion of a web page to change or cycle through different pieces of information stored in the personal binder.

Accordingly, in Dusevic, the content stored in the personal binder is already existing content that is identified by the user in the task-centric online environment. To the extent there is any "customization," it is just selecting which content to include or display in the personal binder. The content itself, however, is not customized. All of the content stored in the personal binder of a first user can still be accessed by any other user through the task centric online environment, just not through the first user's personal binder if protected by a

user ID and password. Accordingly, in contrast to claim 1, Dusevic fails to disclose or suggest that the at least one customized task is different from any generic task and is generated according to information provided by the first customer.

Even if combinable, Leisten fails to cure the deficiencies of Dusevic. Like Dusevic, Leisten fails to disclose or suggest the at least one customized task is different from any generic task and generated according to information provided by the first customer, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten.

Claims 2-4 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 16-19 and 31-34 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Claim 5 recites that a method for developing an application comprises identifying one or more rules and one or more generic tasks corresponding to the identified one or more rules included in a first generic application, receiving a request to modify the first generic application into a first custom application, and generating at least one customized task based upon the received request. The method further comprises modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application.

The Response to Arguments does not address any of the arguments set forth in the Response filed on November 12, 2004. Rather, the Examiner has reasserted that same basis for rejecting claim 5 as in the first Office Action. In particular, the rejection again relies on Fig. 14 and the corresponding description of Dusevic.

As explained in the Response of November 12, 2004, Fig. 14 illustrates an exemplary macro tasks page 124 for the structural interpretation work area in a task-centric online environment directed towards geology and geophysical area of the oil and gas industry (see [0348]). In the example of Fig. 14, a high-level task 110 is selected to display subtasks 112

of the high-level task, and one of the subtasks 112 is selected to display the task details 114 of the selected subtask (see [0348]). Dusevic further discloses that a customer may use a subset of a vendor's products, such as one or more applications (see [0349]). If the subset of applications are not integrated, the macro tasks page 124 helps to define relationships between the applications (see [0349]).

To explain this concept, Dusevic provides an example using one application for interpreting seismic data and another application for interpreting well data (see [0350]). When a particular subtask 112 is selected, task details 114 of the subtask are displayed in the page 124, and the task details 114 of the selected subtask 112 can be directed at the integrated use of the vendor's products (i.e., the applications for interpreting seismic data and interpreting well data) to perform the selected subtask 112 (see [0350]). Further, the task details 114 may show things the end user needs to do and not to do, as well as the consequences of not performing the tasks properly (see [0350]). Accordingly, Fig. 14 and the corresponding description of Dusevic disclose a system for providing guidance on how to work with two or more applications if they are not already integrated.

In contrast to claim 5, there is nothing in Fig. 14 or the corresponding disclosure of Dusevic that discloses or suggests receiving a request to modify a first generic application into a first custom application, and generating at least one customized task based upon the received request. Rather, as discussed above, the end user in Dusevic merely selects one or more existing applications to use, and one or more existing task details explain what the user needs to do to use the existing applications. However, Dusevic does not disclose or suggest that an existing application is modified into a custom application.

Furthermore, since Dusevic fails to disclose or suggest modifying an existing application into a custom application, Dusevic necessarily fails to disclose or suggest modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application, as recited in claim 5.

Even if combinable, Leisten fails to cure the deficiencies of Dusevic. Like Dusevic, Leisten fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request to modify a first generic application into a first custom application, generating at least one customized task based upon the received request, and modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application, as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten.

Claims 6-15 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten by virtue of their dependence from claim 5, as well as their additional recitations. In particular, claim 6 recites that the request includes details about tasks to include in the first custom application, and the at least one customized task is generated according to the details. Claim 8 recites that the at least one customized task is a new task different from the identified one or more generic tasks. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dusevic and Leisten both fail to disclose or suggest generating a customized task according to information received from the user nor that the customized task is a new task different from the generic tasks. Accordingly, claims 6 and 8 further distinguish the claimed invention from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten.

Claims 20-30 and 35-45 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten for reasons analogous to claim 5.

Applicants submit that entry of the amendments to claims 1, 16, and 31 is proper inasmuch as the amendment substantially corresponds to subject matter already claimed, such as claims 6 and 8, which have already been considered by the PTO. Applicants note that 37 C.F.R. §1.116(c) provides for entry of amendments touching the merits of the application after final rejection where there is a showing of good and sufficient reason why they are necessary and were not earlier presented. Here, Applicants submit that, to the extent that the amendments to claims 1, 16, and 31 may touch on the merits of the application and were not already considered in the context of claims 6 and 8, the amendments to independent claims 1, 16, and 31 were not earlier presented because the rejections in the present Office Action set

forth a new argument within the previously cited references and thus fall within the exception to the general rule set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5/10/05

By MK Weinstein for Serial No 25874

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Marc K. Weinstein  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,250